



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXI.

---

FEBRUARY, 1896.

---

## THE VENEZUELAN QUESTION.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE, ONE OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATES  
TO THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

---

THE ringing shock of the President's Message to Congress upon the Venezuelan question, and of its rebound when it struck the other side of the Atlantic, has now ceased to split our ears; the disturbed air has returned so nearly to its normal condition as to allow us again to hear our own voices. Men can now speak to each other on both sides of the ocean assured of being heard and understood.

We begin to enquire what all this noise has been about. In order to know this and understand it, we have only to consider one leading characteristic of the English-speaking race, common to each of the two nations which comprise the whole of the domineering, aggressive, conquering, and prevailing strain to which we belong—their land hunger. Our race has experienced no difficulty whatever in accepting the promise that the “Saints shall inherit the earth,” the discovery that the language of the Saints was purely English, followed hard upon. Consider Britain, this little island in the North Sea, and its pendant, Ireland, a territory that could be placed in the middle of the one state of Texas, and yet all the cotton that the world uses grown upon the rim left outside. Can a more startling statement be made than that this isle holds under her flag about one-fourth of the earth's

whole surface, and the same proportion of its population? So much for the land. As for the water, no power on earth can peep its head out beyond the neutral three leagues from shore, except by her august permission. How has this miracle been performed? There is only one answer. The English-speaking race is the "boss" race of the world. It can acquire, can colonize, can rule. It establishes law and administers justice everywhere it settles, where before there was neither the one nor the other. It tolerates all religions and encourages a free press; it makes free men in free states.

This breed of men landed at Plymouth Rock and speedily pushed out all the other races, and established here one of the centers of its own race. In due time the colony came of age, and, being a true and legitimate son of its mother, it set about founding a freer government in a freer state than had ever yet been formed, even by the mother—instigated thereto, not by native Americans, not by Puritans or Knickerbockers, but by the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, who first proclaimed that America should be of right free and independent, a doctrine which the native American accepted from them eighteen months later. The movement for independence in their adopted land fell legitimately upon my fellow-countrymen, whose ancestors had been engaged for centuries maintaining the independence of their own. Wherever he roams, if he finds no country he begins the work of creating one, for a country the Scot must have, to live, and, if necessary, to die for. To "die for one's Country" sounds well; "to die for one's Colony" does not *ring*. The younger branch of our race here quickly acquired the territory of the Colonies, a narrow strip of land skirting the Atlantic Ocean, with a total population of three millions, and founded the Republic thereon. This was their first acquisition of territory, following the example of the mother. This was little more than a century ago, and to-day, by successive purchases from civilized governments, and upon one occasion by war with a government, by treaties, purchases, and war with the various Indian tribes, the first acquisition, with three millions population, has become 3,500,000 square miles of the present, with seventy millions of English-speaking people. By the purchase of Louisiana and the acquisition of Texas and California from Mexico, the new country, at the beginning

scarcely more than 200 miles in width along the Atlantic, now stretches 3,000 miles in a straight line from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, and from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico almost 1,500 miles. Alaska, purchased from Russia, extends so far to the west that San Francisco, upon the Pacific, is now in the middle of the territory of the United States, which extends east and west nearly 6,000 miles. The action of the race in the old home and in the new in regard to territorial acquisition has thus been precisely the same. The mother has dominated or acquired almost everything with which she has come in contact and which she coveted, and the son has been no discredit to his mother in the same line. It is a root passion, some of us think a prerogative, of our race to acquire territory.

There is, however, one difference which makes "all the difference" between the positions of the old land and the new in the gratification of their land hunger. Happy new land, whose lines of development lay across coterminous territory (Alaska excluded), which being acquired formed one compact solid nation! Her great estate lies within a ringed fence. She is forty-five nations in one without a visible dividing line. The citizen can walk from ocean to ocean and find no break in the earth under his feet, and she is so firmly knit together by the Federal system that every day makes her more surely one great nation—one homeogenous people—and yet by her political system she proves that the freest government of the parts makes the strongest government of the whole.

The task of territorial aggrandizement before the United States was thus comparatively easy. She had only to grow and spread herself naturally over unoccupied territory, which was part of one unseparated whole and which being occupied became part of her united self.

How different has been the task of Britain, and how startlingly different the result. This little island, having no coterminous territory, long endeavored to obtain acquisitions upon the continent. The King of England has been the King of France. As the continent grew in population the task became too great even for the conquering race in little Britain, and she was driven back within her own small boundaries. Her attention was then necessarily directed to all parts of the earth, however distant. If she could not have more room at home she sought it everywhere abroad and has been highly successful in the search. The

result is, however, that she is the most disjointed and loosely knit Empire that can be conceived of. Her office is that of the mother; she begets numerous children, nurses them tenderly, is a most generous parent, but all her care leads to one inevitable end—her children obtain maturity and leave the household. All that there was of this Republic was once hers; it is now all lost. Canada remains only nominally hers, a wayward child, unjust and tyrannical to her mother because bursting into manhood. She taxes the products of Great Britain; refuses to be bound by copyright treaties embracing the British Empire, of which, nevertheless, when occasion demands she still claims to be part; she has created all the trouble that has arisen between England and America in regard to the Bering Sea dispute; Pauncefoot and Blaine settled all that and Salisbury wired his congratulations, but Canadians appeared in Washington and informed Sir Julian that if Britain presumed to make treaties for Canada she would not have Canada many weeks, and the Marquis of Salisbury quietly tore up the treaty he had so cordially approved; she is now troubling the United States upon a question of boundary. All these restless revolts against authority prove that the days of her dependence upon the old land pass quickly. A recent English writer has said that every hour in Australia a Monarchist dies and a Republican is born. Federated Australia already looms upon the horizon, which in turn must soon lead to an independent Republic. There is no escape from this great law of development, and many of the statesmen of England probably know it well, although not one lives bold enough to tell his countrymen the truth he may so clearly see. They follow the example of Beaconsfield who, while living, catered to what is called the “Imperial idea,” and yet we see from his letters recently published that he was deceiving his countrymen while he wrote his sister the truth. “The Colonies are millstones around the neck of England; they lean upon us when they are weak, and leave us when they become strong.” When English statesmen speak of imperial federation, it may often be suspected that they have two opinions upon the subject, as Beaconsfield had, and that the wish is father to their words, not to their thoughts. Some day the people of England will become as wise as Lord Beaconsfield was, when politicians can deceive them upon this point no longer.

We should be greatly sorrowful for Britain if it were not

clearly seen that this growth of colonies to maturity, and thence to independence, was favorable to the increase, enterprise and power of our English-speaking race as a whole. One cannot help feeling for the mother who sees her children successively leave her to start in life for themselves, and we bow before this wonderful, small but mighty old mother England in reverence and sympathize deeply with her in the wrenches which she is compelled to undergo in the course of nature. Nevertheless, it is better for our race that it should be so. If her offspring were content to live as colonists, we could no longer be proud of her blood.

How have these coveted lands been acquired by the two divisions of our race? Into that, alas, it were well for the strict moralist not to enquire too curiously. Let us assume that it is best described by saying "by hook or by crook." Too often the lamb has troubled the waters for the wolf. Whatever the agencies may have been—and these have constantly become less dubious since the start—over all there rests this source of satisfaction that, upon the whole, the management of the land acquired by our race has been best for the higher interests of humanity. It is an evolution, the fittest driving out the least fit; the best supplanting the inferior; and the interests of civilization rendered the acquisition of the land necessary. It was right and proper that the nomadic Indian should give place to the settled husbandman in the prairies of the West; it is also well that the Maori should fade away, and give place to the intelligent, industrious citizen, a member of our race.

Great Britain has, therefore, necessarily acquired lands "by hook or by crook" in any part of the world, as the United States has acquired land adjoining her by just the same means. Our Indian treaties and subsidies, our Mexican war, would readily give us illustration, but with the United States we are not now concerned. It is from England's similar policy we have to draw, and no finer illustration of the *modus operandi* can be given than her dealings with Venezuela. She begins modestly by claiming a boundary; Venezuela requests her to submit her claims to arbitration; this is refused; the matter rests awhile, when it appears that the boundary of England has been shifted a good deal and embraces more territory adjoining Venezuela; another remonstrance from Venezuela, and another rest. When the question revives, Britain discovers she was mis-

taken again and did not claim enough, and her third claim extends far beyond the second. Finally, there is a fourth line drawn which reaches over valuable auriferous deposits, and really lands Great Britain on the banks of the Orinoco. This was rather too much, and Venezuela again asked the good offices of the United States to beg Great Britain to submit the question to peaceful arbitration. This Great Britain agreed to do in 1885 through Lord Granville. There would have been no Venezuelan dispute had the doctrine of continuous foreign policy been adhered to, but the present Prime Minister of Great Britain, who is the one man wholly responsible for all that has occurred to embitter English-speaking men, actually refused to carry out the agreement of his predecessor to arbitrate the whole question.

The *Daily News*, of London, as we note by a recent cable, begins a conciliatory editorial upon the Venezuelan question with these words: "We believe the British claim to be just." But the talented gentleman who has recently been called to the editorial chair of that great organ, and who is destined to become a great force, unfortunately omits to indicate which of the several claims he has found to be the just one. Probably the scale runs thus: First claim, just; second, more just; third, most just, as it gives Britain most territory. Thus do "Justice" and "Claims" of our race—when upon the prowl to satisfy their land hunger—in delightful harmony, contemporaneously swell, like Siamese twins, mutually nourishing each other.

This is certainly one of the most flagrant exercises of brute force against a weak power which can be adduced to illustrate the propensity of the English-speaking race to absorb as much of the land of the world as it possibly can, and this policy in the case of Venezuela would have been triumphantly successful, had the question remained one between the very weak Lamb and the very strong Wolf. I do not mean to hold Great Britain up to peculiar opprobrium. What the race in Great Britain would do, the race upon this side would do, and no doubt has done—although it is but just to say that the natural instinct leading to abrupt appeal to force is somewhat modified in the American through intermixture of blood with races less strongly possessed of the dominating spirit. He offers arbitration. I present this instance of the powerful grasping from the weak, not as an English trait, but as a race trait.

Successive American governments have done their best to bring Great Britain back to its promise to arbitrate, made by Lord Granville in 1885, but without avail. Secretaries of State Bayard, Blaine, and Gresham, in successive administrations, have gently intimated to Great Britain that this was the only honorable course she could pursue, and that the United States would be greatly pleased if she fulfilled her agreement. It was, therefore, impossible for President Cleveland's administration to turn its back upon the cause of weak Venezuela, even had it been so disposed. Previous governments having listened to her appeal, and being convinced of the justice of her request for arbitration, which as we see Britain had herself acknowledged, the United States was bound to call upon Great Britain for a definite answer, whether or no she were willing to fulfil her honorable engagement and submit her claims to an impartial judge for peaceful settlement as she had agreed to do in 1885. The precise form adopted in doing this does not touch the principle involved, but it is well frankly to admit that public opinion in the United States to-day favors the view that the menacing part of the President's Message had better been omitted. Asking Britain to carry out what she had agreed to do through Lord Granville and standing for arbitration, the President's position was impregnable and bound to win. Had he stopped with asking Congress for authority to appoint a Commission to ascertain the true boundary between Britain and Venezuela, solely for the guidance of the United States, the most potent part of his message as published would have been tenfold more potent, left to the imagination unsaid.

Insisting with an adversary upon the duty of accepting peaceful arbitration is one thing; insisting upon peaceful arbitration, *or* ————— quite another. But this is to be said for the President: he had great provocation in Lord Salisbury's reply. Going beyond the rejection of the Monroe Doctrine as inapplicable to the case, as he did, into an irritating discussion as to the existence of the Doctrine itself, and his refusing on the part of Great Britain to accede to the known wishes of the United States that the dispute with a weak sister Republic upon this continent should be peacefully settled, were enough to raise even as calm and phlegmatic a man as the President to indignant words. On the other hand, let us be fair, Lord Salis-



bury had received great provocation in Secretary Olney's dispatch. It is an able paper upon the whole, but how a man capable of writing such a paper, should permit himself to depart so far from fact as to say that the United States is sovereign upon the American continent and its *fiat* law, passes comprehension. This is not the case, as every schoolboy knows, and the effect of such a claim upon the sister Republics of the South must be most injurious. Had Mr. Blaine, when presiding over the Pan-American Conference, even intimated that the United States claimed anything beyond equality with these Republics, the Conference would have dispersed at once. More than one unintentional word bearing upon the power of the elder brother gave evidence of the extreme sensitiveness of the delegates of the sixteen States of South America who were representative men of their respective countries. Fortunately for us the pride of the Spanish race in South America is not to be trifled with. It was not for nothing that President Harrison, on receiving these delegates when their labors were ended, said to them: "We have had in your honor a military review, not to show you that we have an army, but to show you we have none."

It is significant that the most important work of the Conference was the adoption of the following by a vote of the sixteen Republics:

"The Republics of North, Central, and South America hereby adopt arbitration as a principle of American International Law, for the settlement of all differences, disputes, or controversies that may arise between them."

Thus is the whole American continent pledged to arbitration, Chili excepted, whose delegates did not vote: a mighty step forward in the march of human progress.

It may take several wise Secretaries of State succeeding Secretary Olney, to fully erase the suspicions which he has so recklessly created. One can understand how Great Britain, who still owns so much of the American continent, must have felt when the alleged sovereignty of the United States over its possessions was thus flaunted in its face. The truth is that neither Lord Salisbury nor Secretary Olney has conducted this correspondence in a manner creditable to his reputation as a diplomat; for their communications have needlessly irritated the

nations to which they were addressed. With President Cleveland's message, it is different; although the menace of war should have been left unsaid, still it was said in a dignified, solemn and impressive manner. There was in it neither bluster nor contradiction of fact. To-day it is scarcely regrettable that his indignation carried him far, because he has certainly called the attention of the masses of the people of Great Britain to the momentous consequences involved by the withdrawal of Lord Salisbury from Lord Granville's agreement to arbitrate in 1885, and by his more recent refusal of arbitration addressed to the American Government. In all probability this will ensure a peaceful settlement of the question with greater ease, and prevent prolonged disturbances which would otherwise have resulted from a less determined attitude.

Let us now consider the condition of public sentiment on both sides. In the United States, East, West, North and South, from which divergent voices were at first heard, there is but one voice now. Public opinion has crystallized into one word—*arbitration*. In support of that mode of settlement we now know the nation is unanimous. The proofs of this should not fail to carry conviction into the hearts of Britons.

The one representative and influential body in the United States which is most closely allied with Britain not only by the ties of trade, but by the friendships which these ties have created, is the Chamber of Commerce of New York. If that body were polled by ballot, probably a greater proportion of its members than of any other body of American citizens would register themselves as friendly to England. So far did the feeling extend in this body, that a movement was on foot to call a meeting to dissent from the President's Message. Fortunately, wiser counsels prevailed, and time was given for an examination of the question, and for members to make up their minds upon the facts. The result was that at the crowded meeting subsequently held, there was passed a resolution, with only one dissenting voice, in favor of a commission for arbitration. In the whole proceedings there was only one sentiment present in the minds of those assembled: "this is a question for arbitration."

Several messages have been exchanged between societies in the two lands, the replies to which, given from this side, should be noted. Here is the latest, which is only one of several. The

Society of Christian Endeavor of England cables begging the 2,000,000 dear young Christian Endeavorers on this side to believe that their brethren and sisters in England "would almost prefer death to hearing that an English gun had been fired against the United States, the broad America so many of us know and love. May God avert so direful a calamity. Bid them not only pray for peace, but remember that we will join them at the mercy seat in earnest entreaty that this, to us, inexplicable alarm may be the occasion for a new and stronger alliance between all Christian hearts on either side of the Atlantic, and that we, the Christian Endeavorers of both countries, will, in the spirit of Christ, do our utmost to create a public opinion in favor of righteousness and peace, whenever either is threatened by our statesmen or our press. Let this be a 'holy alliance' that shall leave its traces on the future history of our world." The following reply was made: "The officers of the United Society of Christian Endeavor heartily reciprocate your sentiments. We pray for peace and for righteous *arbitration* of all difficulties between nations."

Judicious readers will notice the absence of one word, "arbitration," in the English telegram, but it is not absent in the American reply. It goes without saying that, when the peace-loving people of the United States with one accord take their stand upon arbitration as the only fair method of settlement, a rejection of that mode which was once accepted by Britain must cause more than grievous disappointment.

Upon the other side of the Atlantic there are cheering signs that the sentiment favorable to arbitration in some form begins to show its force and wins its way. The most noteworthy is, of course, that furnished by the words of the London *Times*:

We would welcome any reasonable method of settling the dispute without a resort to force.

There is no particular sanctity in the Schomburgk line, but it was regarded by Great Britain as marking off virtually settled districts from those still unoccupied.

It ought not to be difficult to determine what districts have been actually occupied by each nation, and, excluding these, to arbitrate on the unsettled districts as a whole. It would not then be necessary to deal with the Schomburgk line at all, while the objects of Lord Salisbury's restriction would be attained.

It is difficult for American readers to understand the unique position of that paper, especially in regard to the foreign policy of

Great Britain. But as an ardent apostle of arbitration, and most anxious for the vindication of that principle in this quarrel, I should rather have those words from the *Times* than similar words from one-half the newspapers in England. They weigh more. The International Arbitration Society, of which Sir John Lubbock is chairman, is, as we learn by cable, to declare for arbitration at its coming meeting. This will not be without influence, but it would have been more powerful had that organization not affiliated with the Peace Society and received its delegates as allies, thus confounding arbitration with "Peace-at-any-price," which compelled me to resign the Vice-Presidency with which I had been honored, holding, as I did, that peaceful arbitration is one of the few causes for which it is not only justifiable, but a duty to fight. Any nation which refuses arbitration in a boundary dispute and thus resorts to war rather than forego its claim to sit as judge in its own cause, should be made to realize the truth of Christ's words: "They that take up the sword, shall perish by the sword." We should fight to prove the truth of that decree, as the only sure means of finally reaching the longed-for reign of peace. If ever the industrial, peace-loving Republic has to draw the sword, may it be in vindication of peaceful arbitration, in international disputes, the Christian substitute for barbarous war.

Many have been watching for Mr. Gladstone's voice in favor of this principle, because of all men living he has done most to establish it between the two branches of our race. It required a powerful man and a noble one to lead Parliament to accept arbitration in the Alabama dispute. Many have wondered how he could remain silent, since the infinitely lesser question, grave as it is, of the sufferings of the Armenians roused him to indignant speech. He spoke at length in his reply to the *Chronicle*, a paper which has done much good service to both Britain and the United States, and should be remembered in this crisis. Mr. Gladstone's words are important. He says: "My opinion of arbitration is unchanged, although it cannot be of use for me to enter the discussion at this moment."

This leaves no doubt of his position now, nor where he will be found should occasion require. He adopted arbitration, when Prime Minister, in the Alabama case with the United States; and he was Prime Minister in 1885 when his Foreign Secretary

accepted the holy principle, in this very Venezuelan dispute which has aroused so much animosity between nations who should be friends. Mr. Gladstone's fame is to rest securely upon this foundation, if none other. In his day he was the foremost and most powerful champion of arbitration.

It is a pity that the record of Mr. Gladstone's successor, Lord Rosebery, as an arbitrationist, is not as good as could be wished in this dispute. He refused arbitration with Venezuela, following Lord Salisbury ; but this he may have done in obedience to the rule of continuity in foreign policy, and it does not follow that he would not have promptly acceded to the express desire of the United States that the dispute should be thus adjusted. Nothing could be better than his message, recently published, in which he scouts the idea of war between the two nations "about a frontier squabble in a small South American republic."

One of the weightiest expressions yet cabled comes from the Solicitor-General of the last Conservative Government, who was offered the same exalted position in the present administration, Sir Edward Clarke. He said to his constituents, in a public speech : "If England goes to war upon this issue, *she will not be in the right.*" So much for arbitration in Britain.

Expressions of good-will and of desire for peace with their kindred here have been too numerous to quote, but there is one which is probably unique in every respect in the whole history of international disputes, and it has done much to relieve the situation. This message was from no less personages than the heir to the British throne and his son in succession :

"They earnestly trust and cannot but believe the present crisis will be arranged in a manner satisfactory to both countries, and will be succeeded by the same warm feeling of friendship which has existed between them for so many years."

No ordinary feeling of good-will and of kinship called forth these graceful, timely, and important words. That they do not echo the sentiments of the good old crowned Queen, who proved her own good-will once before for the Republic at a memorable crisis, can not be supposed. This message bursting through the limits of official reserve may safely be taken to indicate a peaceful solution, and proves again that blood is thicker than water. It is from the heart, and none of us can hereafter say or write that the Prince of Wales is chiefly the leader of

fashion and without much influence or power beyond this sphere. In this matter his has been the most potent voice of all that have reached us. He has sown precious seed, from which some day he may reap a golden harvest, and from which he can even this day safely assure himself, that he has powerfully contributed to the maintenance of peace within the world-wide possessions of our race.

It is possible, of course, perhaps probable, that Lord Salisbury may agree direct with Venezuela, as he has the right to do. President Cleveland opens a wide door here, saying any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States. Such a settlement might naturally be more agreeable to Lord Salisbury than a return to arbitration which he has rejected. Although any peaceable settlement would be well it would not be so conducive to future peace, nor render war between the countries so nearly impossible, as if the policy of arbitration received in this instance further vindication, and the added force of another precedent to influence future generations.

The simple truth is that the British in the past have laid their hand on all the territory they could acquire in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America in obedience to their instinct for expansion, and having successfully done so, they were still endeavoring to carry out the same policy upon the American Continent with, as they supposed, the weak Republic of Venezuela, when they were suddenly confronted with their own race and equals in the art of acquisition of territory, and this completely changed the situation. They had not the slightest intention of interfering with the United States, nor have they now. The silver lining to this war cloud consists not in the fact that the United States have succeeded in making the Monroe Doctrine a part of international law, which it is not, but that it has succeeded in convincing Britain and Europe of a much more potent fact, that it is a deep rooted instinct inherent in the blood of the larger half of our dominating race.

Great Britain, as far as the other half of her race is concerned, may still acquire any land she can in Europe, Asia and Africa, and Americans will regard the spread of her people with pride and satisfaction, if she will kindly permit them hereafter to

superintend territorial changes upon the American continent, and uphold the doctrine of peaceful arbitration upon it. Nor can she fairly grudge her race here one continent when she has freedom to roam over three.

Every nation has its "Red Rag," some nations have more than one, but what the "Right of Asylum" is to Great Britain, the Monroe Doctrine is to the United States. Each lies very deep in the national heart. Few statesmen of Great Britain do not share the opinion of Lord Salisbury, which he has not feared to express, that the "Right of Asylum" is abused and should be restricted, but there has not arisen one in Britain sufficiently powerful to deal with it. The United States never had, and has not now, a statesman who could restrain the American people from an outburst of passion and the extreme consequences that national passion is liable to bring, if any European power undertook to extend its territory upon this continent, or to decide in case of dispute just where the boundary of present possessions stand. Such differences must be arbitrated.

There comes in the life of every manly man a time when he has to assert his own manhood. It is difficult for the mother to understand, or to approve of, the child she nursed in his utter helplessness, standing up against her fond decisions for his career and in turn ruling over his mother for her good. The Republic has become of age and entered into the possession of his heritage. It has so much room that its desire does not go in the direction of acquiring non-coterminous territory to which alternative his parent land is reduced. It is as the elder brother of the sixteen Republics upon this continent that it intends to act. It claims no sovereignty over the weakest of these, nor has it any intention to interfere in their domestic concerns; neither does it desire to hasten the departure of European powers from this continent by anything save the operations of natural causes, which are ending their sway as rapidly, perhaps, as is desirable. In vain does Britain labor to build up British communities in British Guiana, or in Canada, or in any portion of this continent; she only establishes and nurses them in their weakness, as Beaconsfield so truthfully said, to see them leave her in their strength. A noble office, the noblest office among nations, that of the mother is hers; but when she attempts to enlarge her boundaries, as she has undoubtedly attempted, by drawing several lines between herself and

Venezuela, each giving her more territory than the other, the other half of the race upon this continent feels that it must now-a-days be consulted; and if that other half out of tender regard for Great Britain, or out of a still higher motive, the feeling of what is due to herself as a Christian nation, asks that the correct boundary shall be determined by arbitration, a grave responsibility rests upon those who reject the olive branch.

In his speech at Manchester Mr. Balfour said he

“Trusted and believed the day would come when better statesmen in authority, and more fortunate than even Monroe, would assert a doctrine between the English-speaking peoples under which war would be impossible.”

That day has not to come, it has arrived. The British Government has had for years in its archives an invitation from the United States to enter into a treaty of arbitration which realizes this hope, and Mr. Balfour is one of those who, from their great position, seem most responsible for the rejection of the end he so ardently longs for. It is time that the people of Great Britain understood that if war be still possible between the two countries, it is not the fault of the Republic but of their own country, not of President Cleveland and Secretary of State Olney, but of Prime Minister Salisbury, and the leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Balfour, who do not accept the offered treaty which would banish war forever between the two nations of our race. This invitation was sent by the same President Cleveland, who is now denounced as favoring war.

I do not share Mr. Stanley's view, which Mr. Balfour seems to echo, that the people of the United States would go to war with Great Britain lightly. As I know them, their regard for the ties that bind the English-speaking race together are not less strong nor less general than that of the people of Britain; but being of that dominating race, the American is sensitive in regard to the affairs of this continent.

He feels that the doctrine of arbitration of disputes renders huge armaments unnecessary. He sees clearly that, the principle of arbitration destroyed, the introduction of the European mode of settlement, war, follows. Hence, he feels it to be his stern duty to uphold arbitration, just as he felt it to be his duty to preserve the Union. He sees that it would be better to rally this continent to its defence, and secure perpetual peace there-



after, by fighting against the first attempt, should any be made, to render this continent, now dedicated to Arbitration, the prey to war as other continents are.

John Bright, Quaker as he was, nevertheless pronounced the war for the preservation of our Union, a duty. Were he alive to-day, he would tell his countrymen that if they persisted in rejecting the American policy of arbitration upon questions affecting the American Continent and lighted the torch of war upon it, all the crimes recorded in human history would pale before this.

Peaceful arbitration is the great gain of this century. It was my office to introduce to Mr. Cleveland, then President of the United States, as he is now, the delegation from the British Parliament urging arbitration. In the conferences I had with him previous to his receiving the deputation, I found him as strong a supporter of that policy as I ever met. I do not wonder at his outburst, knowing how deeply this man feels upon that question; it is to him so precious, it constitutes so great an advance over arbitrament by war that—even if we have to fight, that any nation rejecting it may suffer—I believe he feels that it would be our duty to do so, believing that the nation which rejects arbitration in a boundary dispute deserves the execration of mankind.

It is only necessary for the people on both sides of the Atlantic to keep in mind that above all other considerations connected with this, in itself, most trivial dispute, there stands imperilled the Christian substitute of peaceful arbitration for barbarous war. The dangerous stage has been already reached and passed. There will be no war between the United States and Great Britain either upon the Venezuelan question or upon any other, because the first has already planted itself upon the rock of arbitration, and the other is slowly but steadily moving toward its acceptance.

No government can live in Britain which dares squarely to persist in rejecting arbitration in a boundary dispute upon the American Continent. There is too much religion, too much conscience, too much sincere desire for peace and good will among men, and far too much genuine kindly feeling among the people from Queen to Peasant for their “kin beyond sea,” to permit any government to commit so great a crime.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.